



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

It has seemed to me, however, in view of the national character which some of the late riots assumed, that without the lamentable recourse to an increase in the army, it would be perfectly legitimate to establish a national constabulary, police or *gendarmerie*, without muskets or cannon, and armed simply as municipal police are armed. These could be quickly massed in any scene of disorder, and by force of numbers and discipline secure the arrest of offenders against law and order, and especially of the leaders and inciters to riot, robbery and murder. A national police of 25,000 men, so used, would be no more objectionable than would a municipal police force, and would, in many instances, obviate the present necessity of summoning the aid of powder and bayonets in the suppression of internal disorders. A similar body in the States would replace the State militia, and render the obnoxious employment of Pinkertons and special deputies unnecessary.

All investigation of real hardships and injustice, and the removal of these, however, and every settlement of a well-founded difference between employer and employee, is far more agreeable to contemplate than even bloodless measures of force. . . .

To the average citizen of the world, who accepts that world as he finds it, on Pope's principle, that "Whatever is, is right," the crusade against an institution so deeply rooted as war seems highly chimerical. But you are making history, and the best kind of history, even in the smallest peace convention. It is now over thirty years since I have taken a very humble share in this crusade, and in that generation, the change that has taken place in the civilized world as to the place of the battlefield in the estimation of mankind, is simply marvellous. The increase of aversion to the horrors of war, of realization of them, of longing for the preservation of peace, is wonderful. There is an awful picturesqueness about a battle, but it is the picturesqueness of the "lake burning with fire and brimstone." Mothers are beginning to see less glory than they used to in having noble and beautiful sons blown to butcher's meat, and trailed about a bloody field, all to gratify a silly folly called "honor," which is really dishonor.

The *knowledge* that most cases of international dispute can be settled with real honor in the peaceable courts of arbitration, and that it *has* been done repeatedly, is becoming familiar to all minds. Even kings and princes are learning that their people do not care to play at the game of war to please them, and pay a tribute of blood to their glory.

For the benefit of those who smile at the audacity of our feeble efforts to reform the world, let me refer to a very recent occurrence. This last spring the Peace Association of Friends of Philadelphia were moved to address a respectful petition to the German Emperor, entreating him, as the greatest war potentate of Europe, to appeal

to all the powers for a reduction, simultaneously, of all their armaments. The memorial was mainly written by an earnest young minister, and breathed a deep spirit of religious sincerity, pleading with him to take this step "as he valued the peace of heaven." They hardly ventured to expect that their petition would receive any attention from the youthful war-lord.

Great, however, was their gratification to see, about a month afterwards, by the associated Press dispatches, that the Emperor of Germany was endeavoring to persuade the other European rulers to reduce their armies in an equal ratio, and had obtained the approval of several of the leading powers, though not of the Czar. At the same time, the Association addressed a similar appeal to the Pope, begging him to use his influence with the Catholic powers to reduce their armies. By a singular coincidence, the Press dispatches stated about the time this must have been received that the Pope was endeavoring to bring about exactly what they asked, and in his recent encyclical he repeated his earnest desire for this result.

Our Friends did not know whether their memorials were the incentive to these steps, whether they shared with other petitioners in persuading the Emperor and Pope to them, or whether they had no part or influence at all in the matter. They only know that they have received from the Emperor William a most gracious acknowledgment of their petition, in which he expresses his deep interest in the subject and thanks them courteously for their "humane and generous intentions."

But let me encourage every one unfeignedly interested against war, and impressed with a consciousness of a duty to do something in this holy cause, not to be appalled by a sense of the vanity of his efforts. "Cast your bread upon the waters;" sow in faith; be not anxious for the result; do not expect the reform to come in your lifetime, but trust to "the eternal years of God," and He, in whose sight the nations of the earth are as dust in the balance, will use our feeble instrumentality as it pleases Him; and you will enjoy the unspeakable even though unmerited glory of having shared in bringing about the distant day when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

## INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

ITS PRESENT STATUS AND PROSPECTS.

BY BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

Paper read at the Mass Peace Convention on July 21 at Ocean Grove, N. J.

It is not so easy as might be imagined, even for one who makes it his business to know what is going on in the line of peace work, to state as I have been asked to do, in definite terms the present status of international arbitration, and still less easy to mark out the path which it is

likely to pursue in the future. In spite of the railroads and the steamships the world is still a pretty big place and there are divers sorts of people dwelling in different parts of it, some of whom still have a large remnant of the animal in them. While one is stating and forecasting, his proposition that arbitration has already triumphed in large measure is liable to be shot in two by a volley of South American musketry, and his prophecy that it is soon to become universal to be cut short by the sound of marching hosts along the Rhine or by the clicking of the telegraph announcing fighting in the far-off hermit nation of Corea. It is only in the most general terms, then, that the present status of international arbitration can be given or its future prospects outlined.

International arbitration is a modern thing, belonging almost entirely to the present century, the arbitrations of the past having been for the most part between individuals and classes and communities rather than between nations. It has come about with the decline of despotism and the growth of liberty, and the consequent development and realization of the idea of nationality in its modern sense. Nations, in the sense of free and independent peoples whose unity is natural and voluntary and that observe in measure the limits which have been marked out for them by the providence of God in the geographic structure of the earth and in the historic development of races, have not existed in any settled and permanent way till this century. This movement toward settled and self-governed nations, which has already resulted in the building up and compacting of this great Republic and in the unification of France, of Italy, of Germany and of various other nations in both hemispheres to a greater or less extent has grown out of the many civilizing and liberating forces which have been playing on society since the birth of Christ, and with it has come sufficient international respect and unselfishness to make arbitration possible. So long as feudalism remained, international arbitration was impossible, because there were really no nations to arbitrate. After the nations were somewhat established, so long as they were ruled by men whose despotic and world-grasping spirit led them year after year into schemes for the subjugation of all other nations, international arbitration was still impossible. With the fall of Napoleon, in whom this spirit found its fullest and final embodiment, the old order of things was broken and the new appeared.

This movement toward independent and mutually respecting nationalities has since gone steadily on and of late years has developed with much rapidity, and international arbitration has appeared and run parallel with it in its whole course. Arbitration implies independent and mutually respecting parties standing over against each other, with difficulties which they cannot settle themselves, because of the strong feeling which each has that he is in the right and cannot therefore yield to the other's view. It also implies a conviction that there is a better and more

rational, or at least a safer and less expensive, way of settling difficulties than that of fighting like brutes about them. It further implies confidence in the fairness and good sense of one's fellowmen, who may be called in to take the dispute and sit down with it in the impartial court of reason and say how it shall be adjusted. It may easily be seen, therefore, why arbitration, though it may have taken place frequently between individuals and small bodies of men, could not, in the moral state of society then existing, have occurred much on an international scale in the centuries past. Much of the spirit of unrespecting selfishness and greed of the past centuries still lingers, and numberless jealousies and bitter feelings left behind by the former tyrannies and aggressions have rendered it much less frequent in our time than it ought to have been; but its appearance in this century in many important cases is a proof that not only individual men but the nations in their dealings one with another have gotten at least one stage above the brute and have begun to be human.

Before giving you a more detailed analysis of the arbitration movement between nations in this century, allow me briefly to call your attention to what arbitration in a simpler and narrower way has accomplished in the past, for the present movement is not alone the outgrowth of Christian civilization in general, but of the arbitrations themselves which are scattered along through the previous centuries. The movement has even a purely human and rational side, so that even among heathen nations and before Christ's time cases of this mode of settling disputes are recorded and many others doubtless occurred which have passed into oblivion. The madness and insanity of war did not always prevail. There were lucid moments when the real human nature temporarily asserted itself. Two sons of Darius settled the question of the succession to the throne by arbitration. Cyrus sought the good offices of a Prince of India to end a dispute between him and the King of Assyria. In the Greek civilization where the State was everything and love of country an all-absorbing passion, cases of arbitration between Greek and Greek were not infrequent, in which the Amphictyonic Councils, famous sages, victors in the games and especially the Oracle at Delphi were the arbitrators. The system of law and of law courts, in which the citizens of a country determine their questions by a forced litigation under the power of the civil authorities, has its root in some of the same principles as arbitration. In the Roman empire this system prevailed and the simpler method of arbitration was not much known.

When Christianity came with its doctrine of love and human brotherhood, arbitration became a frequent and probably the usual method by which difficulties between individual Christians were settled. You will remember Paul's passionate appeal to the Corinthians in behalf of this simple Christian method as against the forced and

selfish litigations of the law courts, which though infinitely better than resort to violence are by no means the most sensible and reasonable method of settling disputes.

In later times the bishop's trials became a fixed institution among Christians. If the history of these Christian settlements by arbitration could be written, it would take the largest library in Christendom to contain the accounts of them. They have been numerous through all the Christian centuries, and are more so in our time than ever before. Not a year has passed, it may be safely asserted, since the first organization of Christian societies in which many a bishop, minister or wise Christian layman, either alone or with others, has not by arbitration or mediation adjusted differences between brethren. The practice thus created and fostered by Christian love and forbearance has largely leavened the whole of society with its influence, and its reasonableness is now nearly universally recognized, even where temporary gusts of passion or hereditary prejudices prevent its employment in particular cases. It is on this basis of Christian principle and practice, running back to the earthly days of the Prince of Peace, that the whole structure of modern international arbitration rests.

What was found so useful and practicable among individuals was naturally seen to be just as capable of successful application to groups and communities of men, and it began early to be so applied. Private war, the great curse of the middle ages, was banished from European society only after the application to it of arbitration and arbitration courts. Feudalism had spread this evil everywhere. Challenges to battle were made for the most trivial and absurd causes. A state of utter lawlessness came to prevail and strife and bloodshed were perpetual. Religious sentiment was evoked against the evil. The clergy preached peace. Men went from village to village proclaiming it in the name of Christ. Great Councils were held to promote it. The popes sent out encyclicals in its behalf. The "Peace of God" was proclaimed and certain days, places and callings were placed under the protection of its sheltering wing. Religious fraternities or peace associations to reconcile enemies were formed. Pledges of peace were administered to the fierce barons over holy relics. But the tide of hatred and of blood surged on. Finally, as a last remedy, when all the efforts put forth for nearly two centuries against the evil seemed about to end in failure, courts of arbitration were formed by the barons, the nobles, the bishops and the cities, and for two centuries and more were applied to the settlement of the almost endless misunderstandings and quarrels of the time. In this way private war was banished from society.

From the beginning of the sixteenth to the opening of the nineteenth century we have the great war movement of nationalities, aggression, bloodshed and desolation on a colossal scale. The feudal lords are replaced by kings

and emperors. Private war with its everlasting bickerings and its petit troops of galloping dragoons and murderous squads of footmen gives place to war between sovereigns and whole peoples, with their great generals, their large armies, their deep-seated hatreds and their craftily laid plans of territorial extension. No sooner are national boundaries marked off than they are disturbed. The map of Europe changes with nearly every campaign. "I saw," said Grotius writing at this time, "throughout all Christendom a readiness to make war which would cause the very barbarians to blush for shame. England, France, Prussia, Austria, Spain, Italy, the Netherlands, are an almost continuous battlefield on which the sound of the cannon is always heard and the blood never ceases to flow. This long, gloomy period of international aggression and crime; the age of Charles the Fifth, of Henry the Eighth, of Bloody Mary, of Frederic the Great, of Charles the Twelfth, of Louis the Fourteenth, of Napoleon the First; the age of the Inquisition and of the French Revolution; the age of the seven years' war, of the thirty years' war, or rather the age of perpetual war, reached its culmination at the opening of this century in the campaigns which ended at Waterloo. Then a reaction came. The common conscience began to revolt at the sight of human beings forever devouring one another and of selfish, haughty sovereigns treading down and destroying all the most sacred rights and interests of men.

The seeds of this revolt had been sown in the seventeenth century. Christian conviction became such and Christian principle had so influenced thought that for the first time the war system was attacked at its very roots. It was declared to be both un-Christian and unreasonable. Hugo Grotius, the great Dutch jurist and theologian, who laid the foundations of the juridic movement against war, attacked it on both these grounds. He declared that war is unlawful and that legal measures should be substituted for it in the settlement of difficulties. He expounded his doctrine with so much force and erudition that he deeply affected the thought of Europe and laid the foundations of a better international law. Publicists took up the problem which he had raised. Projects for universal peace were drawn up. Kant, Locke, Montesquieu, Bentham and others labored with the question from a philosophic and economic standpoint. Lessing and Herder put the new thought into verse. The foundations of the modern movement were laid deep in the religious sentiment by George Fox and William Penn and later by John Wesley.

The peace movement of this century, growing out of these historic preparations and coming as a revolt against the bloody régime of the three preceding centuries, took two lines of development, one sentimental, the other juridic. The sentimental, or that for the awakening and educa-

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 209)

new republic, which had already been informally recognized by Minister Willis. The envoys who had recently come from the former queen of Hawaii met with nothing at Washington to encourage them. The sympathies and best wishes of the people of the United States, almost universally, are with the new republic and its leaders. The best has doubtless been done that could have been in the islands, in view of all the difficult circumstances.

The island of Sicily was visited by a violent earthquake on the 8th of August, in which the province of Catania severely suffered. Some villages were entirely destroyed, and much damage was done in others. Many persons were killed and large numbers severely injured.

Owing no doubt to the fact that something has been done to make known what may be expected in the way of Customs for at least a few months, the gold reserve has materially increased this month, and the general treasury balance stands at more than \$7,000,000 above the figures at the close of July.

A bill against lobbying was introduced into the Senate on the 8th of August by Senator Allen. A lobbyist is defined as one who habitually endeavors to secure legislation in Congress by influencing Members of Congress. Upon conviction of lobbying in the District of Columbia, the penalties imposed are a fine of not less than \$1000 or more than \$5000, or imprisonment in the jail of the District of Columbia for not less than one year or more than five. This is another step in the right direction.

The Chinese treaty as drawn up by Secretary Gresham was ratified in the Senate on the 13th of August. This treaty provides that Chinese laborers be prohibited from coming to this country for a period of ten years except under certain conditions which are specified. Those having lawful wives and families or owning \$1,000 worth of property may return after an absence not to exceed a year, or on application, if a sufficiently good reason is assigned, the right to return may be extended to two years. All laborers leaving the United States must give the collector in writing a full description of his family and property. The provisions of the treaty do not affect Chinese subjects other than laborers now privileged to come to the United States and to travel therein. The laborers are guaranteed the right of passage through the country. The right of China to require like registration from all citizens of the United States residing in China is recognized, and the United States agrees to furnish the Chinese government annually a list of all her citizens who are residing in China.

The tariff bill became a law on the 27th without receiving the signature of the President. The Senate and House both adjourned at two o'clock on the 28th.

In the midst of tariff reform, strikes, and what not some people found time and thought to give to the celebration of the one hundredth Anniversary of the poet Bryant's birthday. As the occasion was most fittingly observed in out-of-doors exercises the managers of the celebration which took place at Cummington, Mass., the poet's birth place, very wisely arranged them for August 16th instead of November 3d, the actual anniversary of his birth.

---

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 203.)

tion of public sentiment against war, has manifested itself in sermons and public lectures, in literary productions, through the press, in peace societies, international congresses and memorials to governments; the juridic, or that for the creation of legal remedies for war, has shown itself in an improved diplomacy, in the reform of international law, in arbitration and in the effort now made for the establishing of permanent treaties of arbitration and a permanent international tribunal. These two lines of movement, one of which is just as important as the other, have been interlaced at every stage and have grown strong together. This much of history was necessary that I might speak intelligibly of the arbitrations of this century.

The first important case of arbitration in the present century was that in 1816 between the United States and Great Britain about the St. Croix river and the Lake boundaries. Since that time seventy-seven important international controversies, minor cases not considered, have been settled in this way, or an average of one a year for the whole period of seventy-seven years. There were two such settlements in each of the years 1839, 1864, 1870, 1881, 1882 and 1884; three in 1863, 1867, 1874, 1880, 1887, 1889 and 1890; four in 1879, 1884 and 1888, and five in 1871, the year in which the celebrated Alabama case was begun at Geneva. Six cases are now pending, between Great Britain and France, between Portugal and Belgium, between France and Venezuela, between Russia and Afghanistan, between Bolivia and Chile, and between the Argentine Republic and Chile. The United States, which in this particular at any rate leads the world, has been a party to thirty-seven of these cases; Great Britain to twenty-six; while ten of the cases, or about one-eighth of the whole number, have been between these two English-speaking nations alone. France has submitted ten difficulties to arbitration, Spain seven, Portugal six, Germany four; Italy and Holland three each; Denmark, Belgium, Russia, Greece and Turkey two each; Switzerland one; Japan and Afghanistan three each; Persia, China and Morocco two each; Liberia one. All of the South American republics except two, and two of the Central American States, have had arbitrations; Bolivia, Paraguay and Ecuador one each; Venezuela

and Argentina two; Costa Rica and Nicaragua three; Brazil, Columbia and Peru four; and Chile six.

In order to gather the lesson taught by these cases, several particulars are to be noticed.

Some of the nations mentioned as having only one or two have not had more, not because they were unwilling thus to submit their disputes, but because they had none to submit. Switzerland, the land of liberty, the neutral ground of the nations, the home of internationalism, whose statesmen have been called on more than those of any other country to act as arbitrators, gets, according to the foregoing list, the honor of submitting only one difficulty to arbitration. In her case, this is her greatest honor, that she has known how to behave herself in her relations to other countries in such a way that she has had no differences with them which a little patient and straightforward diplomacy could not speedily adjust. She has recently asked Italy to join her in referring to arbitration a question which has arisen in connection with the commercial treaty existing between them, and the latter country, the violator of the treaty, has so far declined to do so. The same thing may be said, with somewhat less emphasis, of a few other countries as of Switzerland. I wish it could be said of all.

It is to be noticed, also, that along with these cases adjusted by arbitration must be placed a large number settled by diplomacy, many of which would formerly have produced war. Many modern diplomats have been in the truest sense of the term peacemakers, and have not only prevented war, but the necessity even of arbitration.

The nations which have taken part in the settlements cited cover a large part of the habitable portion of the globe, and include a considerable number of countries not usually thought to be much civilized. This also has its significance as showing the tendency of the time toward greater humanity through the leavening influence of Christian principle.

The cases cited cover nearly every sort of question with which nations have to deal in their relations to other nations: questions of boundary and violation of territory, found in at least twelve of the cases; of trespasses committed and injuries received in time of war; of the murder of citizens of one country by those of another; of disputed sovereignty over islands; questions of protectorates, of seizure of ships, of interference with commerce, of fisheries, etc. Some of the controversies have been the occasion of a diplomatic correspondence carried on for months and sometimes for years by some of the ablest statesmen of modern times. In some instances, after diplomacy had exhausted its wit and its resources, the cases have been dropped for a time only to be taken up again and finally referred to disinterested parties. Large sums of money have been involved in a number of the disputes, no less than \$22,000,000 having changed hands in the three cases between the United States and Great Brit-

ain in 1871. The sense of national dignity and honor has often been keenly touched in the earlier stages of the controversies, and the newspapers on both sides have not infrequently tried to kindle the flame of war.

All these difficulties, though of exactly the same kind as those which in former times resulted speedily in disastrous and often long-continued wars, have, however, finally been settled with no great delay, with a trifling outlay of money, and without the least injury to the self-respect or honor of any country involved. The decisions have, with one or two trifling exceptions, been accepted cheerfully and faithfully carried out, and not the shadow of a war-cloud has ever been produced by one of them. On the contrary, the result has nearly invariably been increased mutual respect and a greater willingness to co-operate in all practicable ways for the common good. Out of the Behring Sea settlement of last August has come the hearty co-operation of the two greatest nations on the face of the globe for the protection of seal life, and fleets of the two governments now float in that far-off sea as peacefully and harmoniously as if they belonged to the same power.

For more than fifty years past the number of these difficulties settled by arbitration has quite exceeded the whole number of international controversies which have led to war, and the rule of the past has become the exception of the present. But one war makes more fuss in the world and gets more notice in the newspapers than a hundred arbitrations. These arbitration settlements have taken place so noiselessly and with so little public excitement that the ordinary well-read citizen could not name more than three or four out of the whole seventy-seven, and the real triumphs of the principle are therefore only vaguely and imperfectly realized. But the facts are substantially what I have given you. They prove that arbitration as a method of settling international controversies has already won its case and justified itself at the bar of human reason, and that it has become, as Mr. David Dudley Field said in the last paper but one that he ever wrote, a recognized part of the public law of the civilized nations. No nation can hereafter go to war until it has first exhausted every possible means of bringing about a peaceful solution of its trouble, without deeply degrading itself before the conscience of the world.

What is to be the future of arbitration? There are still people not a few who, when you talk to them of it and urge its claims to universal adoption, smile with incredulity at your earnestness as if nothing had happened to justify your enthusiasm and your faith. Poor souls! If they were inside the gate of heaven and saw the fruit of the tree of life hanging just within their grasp, they would think themselves still in a barren and fruitless world with no hope of anything better. I do not mean to say that we are yet inside the borders of the promised land of peace, but we have certainly gotten measurably out of the

wilderness. Dr. Talmage, who has heretofore been a thorough believer in the sword as a civilizer, said the other day in San Francisco, starting on his journey round the world, that "there will never be another great war," that "arbitration will take the place of the sword." In a general way, if not literally, this prophetic statement may be taken as fairly portraying the probable and not very remote future of human society. The great tide of civilization which Christ has created is setting steadily in that direction, whatever retrograde movements there may be in particular places. It is apparent to everyone that there are still serious obstacles in the way of the universal application of this mode of adjusting international disagreements. These obstacles ought not to exist. They will in the near future be removed, but they are still here. The painful thing which you may have noticed in the list of cases cited above is that none of them have been between certain of the great nations of Europe which have had the most need of them. They stand apart, each leaning upon its arms, each unwilling to admit that the other may have some substantial ground of right on its side and that it itself may possibly be in the wrong. The old spirit of aggression and conquest is dead, or nearly so, but the bitterness of feeling left behind by the cruelties and humiliations of former times seems to render some of the nations incapable of letting by-gones be by-gones without another vengeful tilt at arms. But sooner or later, either after another great war or without one, these old grudges and hatreds will yield to the pressure which is being brought upon them from every side. The growing spirit of reasonableness and good will which has rendered arbitration so frequent in the near past will render it universal in the near future. This it seems to me is the only rational interpretation of the signs of the times.

The peace movement, now so strong and widespread in nearly all civilized countries, both among the masses and in the national parliaments, is lately concentrating itself upon two things: the establishment of permanent treaties of arbitration after the model of the Pan-American treaty of 1890, and the organization of a permanent international tribunal of arbitration. The subject of a tribunal is claiming the serious attention of the Peace Congresses, of the Association for the Reform of International Law, of the Interparliamentary Peace Union, and of eminent jurists and publicists, a large permanent Committee of whom has been appointed to promote the subject before Governments. Senator Sherman has already twice introduced into the United States Senate a bill providing for a Commission to bring the matter before the civilized Governments. Last month a joint resolution was introduced into both Houses of Congress requesting the President to negotiate a twenty-five years' treaty of arbitration with Great Britain. Great Britain by a unanimous vote of Parliament, the 16th of June last year,

signified her willingness to co-operate with our country in this direction, and when Senator Allison introduced his resolution into the Senate on the 20th of June just passed, a congratulatory telegram came to him from London saying that three hundred members of Parliament had just signed a petition in favor of such a treaty between the two countries. There are those in this audience to-day who will live to see the proposed treaty signed and in force; who will, further, see the Pan-American treaty, which has not yet been acted on by the Governments whose representatives signed it at Washington, taken up and ratified by every nation in the New World; who will see similar treaties entered into by the United States and nations of the Old World; and I think it not unlikely that the youngest of those here may see a cordon of such treaties binding together England and France, France and Italy, Italy and Austria and possibly France and Germany and Germany and Russia. The International tribunal will follow as a matter of course. All this looks like the work of centuries, but in our time the work of a century is crowded into a few years, and so it may be in this case. But if it takes centuries, arbitration and the humane spirit out of which it springs will by and by banish international war from the earth as it did private war at the close of the middle ages.

Then the nations will enter upon a still higher civilization, for the arbitration stage is not the highest of which they are capable. There are multitudes of individuals who not only do not fight but who do not even arbitrate, because they have no controversies to arbitrate. They live together in harmony and mutual helpfulness and settle themselves all differences that arise between them. So much has Christian principle done for individual men. Nations are not only capable of the same high and beautiful attainment, but are manifestly approaching it. When swords shall have been beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks, and the nations shall no longer have in their hands any implements with which to fight, little use will then be found for arbitration. Diplomacy, which even now settles many international differences, will then be such a ministry of peace and good will that it will be able to resolve them all without any bitterness or threat of war. For the speedy coming of this happy time, every follower of Jesus Christ is bound, by his profession and by the life of peace with God which he lives, both to labor and to pray.

## MAGAZINES AND PAPERS.

### NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

The lesson of the recent strikes is discussed in a symposium in the *North American Review* by Gen. N. A. Miles, Hon. Wade Hampton, Mr. H. P. Robinson, editor of the "Railway Age," and Mr. Samuel A. Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor.